

THE SHALER JURY LOCKED UP

CROSS-EXAMINATION OF THE GENERAL
WITNESSES WHO WOULD BELIEVE HIM WITHOUT CORROBORATION—THE ARGUMENTS.

The Shaler case reached its climax yesterday and only the verdicts of the jury is now awaited. The twelve good men and true selected out of the box at 8:45 p.m., their minds filled to the brim with the facts accumulated by the counsel and the law and rulings of the learned judge, and at 11 o'clock they were locked up for the night. At 8 o'clock General Shaler and the jury were taken to different restaurants by the Sheriff's officers for supper, and were then brought back to the court-room. The General talked with his friends until at 11 o'clock Judge Barrett sent word to the jury that he would bid them good night, and then the General adjourned down to the Astor House in the company of Order of Arrest Clerk McCormick. The jury were then locked in their room and no verdict will be rendered until the court convenes at 11 a.m. to-day.

The usual array of counsel, witnesses and jurors filled the courtroom in the morning when General Shaler took his seat on the witness stand. He told all the same story as on the previous trial. Wilson's story, he said, was devoid of whole cloth, as far as any corruption concerned went. He had asked him to take up the mortgages on his New-Jersey property several times before and had been refused because Wilson said he was not in funds. On the cross-examination the General was cool, self-possessed and could not be trapped into any flagrant contradiction. In the recommendation of the attorney he said that he supposed that Wilson was acting out of friendship for the owners. The General was on the stand about two hours in all.

General Martin T. McMahon satned upon the jury and told them how he had been Adjunto-General of the Sixth Corps during the war, then Corporation Attorney, Register of Taxes, and now United States Marshal. He recited his acquaintance with General Shaler, saying:

"He is with me a member of several organizations, admission to which depends on high character," and he gave an affirmative answer when asked if he would believe the General under oath without corroboration.

Hugh N. Camp said that he was a real estate broker. He was about to say that he had examined the armory site at Ninety-eighth-st., and thought it worth the price paid, when Mr. Neill barred his path with an emphatic objection. The Judge sustained the objection and remarked:

"If the defense suppose that I am going to permit a number of brokers to come here and say that they think this property is worth the price paid for it, they greatly misunderstand me." The counsel for the defence had no further use for Mr. Camp.

General John Cudcrane was called to the stand and put through his pedigree. "I have been Surveyor of the Port," said he. "I was an Alderman [laughed] twice," followed by hearty laughter.

Q.—When did you cease to be an Alderman? A.—Just previous to 1884.

This upset the gravity of the Judge himself. General Edward L. Moulins testified that he had been connected with the State militia since 1850 and knew General Shaler "intimately by reputation." The Judge suggested that the defense had laid a full foundation for the final question. Mr. Graham took the hint and quickly put the unQUESTIONABLE to the witness's willingness to accept the statement of the defendant under oath without any sort of corroboration and got the usual affirmative response. A little heat was infused into the proceedings when General J. Watts De Peyster took the stand. He is an old-style soldier with a strict way of talking and a decided blunt manner. When asked his business he said "None" with an emphasis on the last word.

No. 24.—Charles McIninch, respondent ex parte, plaintiff in error, agt. Mary F. and J. O'Brien, respondents, ex parte, defendants in error, and others, am. b. & c. Dian against the application, and reserved its decision.

Judge Barrett, in the Supreme Court, Special Term, recited to the court a story from his position as trustee of the estate of his father and directed that as accounting be made to his sister, Mrs. Mary Grace Richardson.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

WASHINGTON, April 20.—The proceedings in the Supreme Court of the United States to-day were as follows:

No. 134.—Thomas Baldwin, plaintiff in error, agt. J. C. Prout, respondent ex parte, and others, am. b. & c. Dian against the application to be set aside on account of the death of the plaintiff.

No. 28.—The Vickshire and Erdman Railroad Company, plaintiff in error, agt. Mary F. and J. O'Brien, respondents, ex parte, defendants in error, and others, am. b. & c. Dian against the application, and reserved its decision.

No. 34.—John Cudcrane, respondent ex parte, and others, am. b. & c. Dian against the application, and reserved its decision.

No. 41.—John W. Lovelace, plaintiff in error, agt. Francis F. Morton and others.

No. 40.—In re—In the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New-York—Dismissal with costs on motion of plaintiff in error.

No. 24.—Charles McIninch, respondent ex parte, plaintiff in error, agt. Mary F. and J. O'Brien, respondents, ex parte, defendants in error, and others, am. b. & c. Dian against the application, and submitted by Joseph P. Horner for appellee.

No. 25.—Hugh N. Camp, respondent ex parte, and others, am. b. & c. Dian against the application, and submitted by Robert W. Wilson, attorney and others, appellees, agt. No. 745—against Carson, plaintiff in error, agt. Mary E. Hart and others. Argument begun by E. Young for the plaintiff in error.

Argued until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THE COURT OF APPEALS.

ALBANY, April 20.—In the Court of Appeals today the following decisions were handed down:

John O'Meara, respondent ex parte, Lewis Abbott, execr. etc., and others, respondents, agt. J. M. Myers, the respondent ex parte, and others, am. b. & c. Dian against the application, and reserved its decision.

Mary Frank, respondent, agt. the Mutual Life Insurance Company, and others, respondents, agt. the Mutual Life Insurance Company, and others, am. b. & c. Dian against the application, and submitted by William H. C. Foster for appellee.

François M. Szwarc, respondent, agt. Dennis Morrison, respondents, appellees, Motion to dismiss at 12 o'clock.

John W. Wood, respondent, agt. Stiles Wood, respondent Motion to dismiss appeal granted with costs, without a hearing, and remanded to the court of appeals to the Supreme Court for any relief to which he may be entitled.

The following cases were argued:

No. 71.—Eliza Engel, respondent ex parte, J. Fisher, appellee, agt. William C. Weston, and C. E. Hubbard for respondent, and others, am. b. & c. Dian against the application, and reserved its decision.

No. 62.—Martha A. Hammett, respondent, agt. the New-York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company, a plaintiff in error, agt. J. M. Myers, the respondent ex parte, and others, am. b. & c. Dian against the application, and submitted by Henry H. Becker, respondent, agt. Caroline L. Elly and others, respondents, filed by appellee, agt. D. O. Jones, James, respondent, agt. Mathew P. Campbell, respondent, agt. Jacob B. Becker for respondent, and others, am. b. & c. Dian against the application, and reserved its decision.

No. 7.—Dennis M. Parker, respondent, agt. Stiles Wood, respondent, agt. B. D. Weston for appellants, agt. J. M. Myers, the respondent ex parte, and others, am. b. & c. Dian against the application, and reserved its decision.

No. 80.—Solomon V. Nease, respondent, agt. Dennis Morrison, respondents, appellees, Motion to dismiss at 12 o'clock.

No. 69.—A. Wood, respondent, agt. Stiles Wood, respondent Motion to dismiss appeal granted with costs, without a hearing, and remanded to the court of appeals to the Supreme Court for any relief to which he may be entitled.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

To the argument of Mr. Graham summed up the case of the defense. He began with Hammett and finally got down to Charles P. Miller. He picked up the story and carried it on until he came to the name of a man whom that person's reputation in a manner worthy of a campaign poster. The main history of that man was that Shaler had not only lied about him, but had lied about the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.

General J. E. Woodward and Stewart L. Woodford took the same story as the other respondents. They said that the trial of the three in the circuit court had been a farce and that the defense announced that they would not return. Nothing was offered in rebuttal. Mr. Martin said that conviction would be a serious blow to the second court of the state, and that the previous trial had been disgraced to the entire country by his most recent request that the case be dismissed as unsupported by testimony, and the judge gave the customary prompt and decisive negative.